

(b)(6)

UNCLASSIFIED

(b)(3) CIAAct

To [redacted]

cc [redacted]

bcc [redacted]

(b)(3) CIAAct  
(b)(6)

06/19/2007 11:57 AM

Subject [AIN] Re: manuscript for PRB review

Please respond to [redacted]

(b)(6)

CLASSIFICATION: UNCLASSIFIED

(b)(3) NatSecAct

19 June 2007

Dear Publications Review Board,

Regarding the manuscript submitted to the PRB on 10 April 2007, working title *Bureaucratic Obstacles to National Security*, under the name [redacted] and the PRB response of 22 May 2007 signed by [redacted] telephoned on 7 June 2007 and left a message asking me to call him. I've called every working day since 7 June and left a message each time with my name and phone number, but have not received a response.

(b)(6)

(b)(3) CIAAct

(b)(6)

As I mentioned in my message of 1 June 2007, the PRB's handling of this manuscript is unusual in that PRB policy with all other manuscripts has been to provide a written response detailing passages the PRB wants removed or rewritten. I've requested such a written response.

I do not believe the manuscript contains classified information. It is critical of the organization, however, and I'm concerned that the PRB sees its mission not as a protector of classified information but rather as a censor of information deemed critical of the organization.

Yours sincerely,

(b)(6)

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

(b)(6)

wrote:

Date: Fri, 1 Jun 2007 09:44:05 -0700 (PDT)

From: [redacted]

(b)(6)

Subject: Re: manuscript for PRB review

To: [redacted]

(b)(3) CIAAct

CC: [redacted]

(b)(6)

1 June 2007

Dear Publications Review Board,

Regarding the manuscript submitted to the PRB on 10 April 2007, working title *Bureaucratic Obstacles to National Security*, under the name [redacted] and the PRB response of 22 May 2007 signed by [redacted] Please provide a detailed description of passages in which you indicate exactly in a track changes document, with strikeouts and suggested additions, adding as footnotes or comments to each strikeout your explanation of what breaches to national security are represented by each passage.

The PRB response of 22 May 2007 contains no details and is merely a blanket disapproval of the entire manuscript. Yet the PRB appears to have provided all other authors with detailed responses.

For example, for the book [redacted], the PRB sent author [redacted] an eight page letter detailing the information which had been determined to be inappropriate for disclosure in the public domain. The PRB sent [redacted] a 19 page, single-spaced letter specifying necessary deletions for his book. The PRB sent [redacted] a 22 page list of redactions for his book [redacted]. For [redacted] book [redacted] the PRB deleted nine of the book's 106,000 words.

During the course of my career I read all memoirs published by current and former employees. The depth of operational information revealed in these memoirs often startled me, and I ensured that no such detail would exist in my manuscript. If there are such details in my manuscript, please let me know what they are and I will remove them.

I am concerned that the PRB sees its role as censor of manuscripts critical of the organization. Books which are critical of the President of the United States but are neutral or complimentary to the organization, such as the recent Tenet and [redacted] memoirs, appear to sail through the PRB review process with minimal changes, even when they contain detailed operational information.

Yours sincerely,

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

[redacted] (b)(6)

(b)(3) CIAAct

(b)(6)

wrote:

Dear [redacted] (b)(6)

(b)(3) CIAAct

Please call me on [redacted] regarding some additional information we need for you manuscript review to begin.

Thanks, (b)(3) CIAAct

(b)(6)

PRB Staff

(b)(6) [redacted] wrote:

>  
> 10 April 2007  
>  
>  
> Dear Publications Review Board,  
>  
> Please review the attached document at your earliest convenience. I am  
> a former employee.  
>  
> The document contains no classified information and, except for public  
> figures, all names, places, events, and dates are completely fictionalized.  
>  
> Yours sincerely,  
>  
> [redacted] (b)(6)  
>  
>  
>  
> -----  
> Never miss an email again!  
> Yahoo! Toolbar  
>  
> alerts you the instant new Mail arrives. Check it out. <  
> http://us.rd.yahoo.com/evt1937/\*http://tools.search.yahoo.com/toolbar/features/mail/>  
>

Take the Internet to Go: Yahoo!Go puts the Internet in your pocket: mail, news, photos & more.

UNCLASSIFIED

(b)(6)

UNCLASSIFIED

(b)(3) CIAAct

To [redacted]

cc [redacted]

bcc [redacted]

(b)(3) CIAAct

(b)(6)

06/01/2007 12:45 PM

Subject [AIN] Re: manuscript for PRB review

Please respond to [redacted]

(b)(6)

**CLASSIFICATION: UNCLASSIFIED**

(b)(3) NatSecAct

1 June 2007

Dear Publications Review Board,

Regarding the manuscript submitted to the PRB on 10 April 2007, working title *Bureaucratic Obstacles to National Security*, under the name [redacted] and the PRB response of 22 May 2007 signed by [redacted] (b)(6). Please provide a detailed description of passages in [redacted] which you indicate exactly in a track changes document, with strikeouts and suggested additions, adding as footnotes or comments to each strikeout your explanation of what breaches to national security are represented by each passage. (b)(3) NatSecAct

The PRB response of 22 May 2007 contains no details and is merely a blanket disapproval of the entire manuscript. Yet the PRB appears to have provided all other authors with detailed responses. (b)(6)

For example, for the book [redacted], the PRB sent author [redacted] an eight page letter detailing the information which had been determined to be inappropriate for disclosure in the public domain. The PRB sent [redacted] a 19 page, single-spaced letter specifying necessary deletions for his book. The PRB sent [redacted] a 22 page list of redactions for his book [redacted]. For [redacted] book [redacted], the PRB deleted nine of the book's 106,000 words. (b)(6)

UNCLASSIFIED

(b)(6)

## UNCLASSIFIED

During the course of my career I read all memoirs published by current and former employees. The depth of operational information revealed in these memoirs often startled me, and I ensured that no such detail would exist in my manuscript. If there are such details in my manuscript, please let me know what they are and I will remove them.

I am concerned that the PRB sees its role as censor of manuscripts critical of the organization. Books which are critical of the President of the United States but are neutral or complimentary to the organization, such as the recent Tenet and Drumheller memoirs, appear to sail through the PRB review process with minimal changes, even when they contain detailed operational information.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted] (b)(6)

(b)(3) CIAAct  
(b)(6)

[redacted] wrote:  
Dear [redacted] (b)(6) (b)(3) CIAAct

Please call me on [redacted] regarding some additional information we need for your manuscript review to begin.

Thanks, (b)(3) CIAAct  
[redacted] (b)(6)  
PRB Staff

(b)(6) [redacted] wrote:

>  
> 10 April 2007  
>  
>  
> Dear Publications Review Board,  
>  
> Please review the attached document at your earliest convenience. I am  
> a former employee.  
>  
> The document contains no classified information and, except for public  
> figures, all names, places, events, and dates are completely fictionalized.  
>  
> Yours sincerely,  
> [redacted] (b)(6)

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

>  (b)(6)  
>  
>  
>  
>  
> -----  
> Never miss an email again!  
> Yahoo! Toolbar  
>  
> alerts you the instant new Mail arrives. Check it out. <  
> [http://us.rd.yahoo.com/evtI937/\\*http://tools.search.yahoo.com/toolbar/features/mail/](http://us.rd.yahoo.com/evtI937/*http://tools.search.yahoo.com/toolbar/features/mail/)>  
>

---

Take the Internet to Go: Yahoo!Go puts the Internet in your pocket: mail, news, photos & more.

UNCLASSIFIED

(b)(3) CIAAct  
(b)(6)

22 May 2007

(b)(6)

Dear [redacted] (b)(6)

We have completed our review of your manuscript entitled *Bureaucratic Obstacles to national Security*. I am sorry to report that, after careful review, we cannot approve any portion of your manuscript. We determined that publication of this manuscript would (b)(3) NatSecAct

That said, we believe that your manuscript could be rewritten in such a way that would not cause harm and we are available to discuss such an option.

As you may know, our procedures allow you to request our reconsideration of this decision. If you wish to do so, please send a letter with your reconsideration request along with any additional information for consideration.

Please feel free to contact me at [redacted] if you have any questions.

(b)(3) CIAAct

Sincerely,

[redacted] (b)(3) CIAAct  
(b)(6)